Progressive Calvinism

Copyright, 1955, by Progressive Calvinism League

VOLUME I FEBRUARY, 1955 NUMBER 2

Contents Page

Is the *Principle* Underlying Socialism-Communism High and Moral and are only Socialist-Communist *Means* Immoral, or are both Principle and Means Immoral? 26

Understanding and Misunderstanding the Hebrew-Christian Law of Love 28

A. The Plain Teaching of Scripture Regarding Brotherly Love 30

B. Analytical Dissection of Scriptural Law of Brotherly Love

C. Scriptural Corrections of Popular Errors Concerning Law Requiring Brotherly Love

D. Arrogance and Sanctimoniousness Associated With Other Definitions of Brotherly Love

(Sections B, C and D will be presented in the third and later issues of PROGRESSIVE CALVINISM.)

Reprint of an Editorial from the CALVIN COLLEGE CHIMES about the First Issue of PROGRESSIVE CALVINISM 43

Membership and Subscription Terms 48

* * *

The attention of readers is called to what was published in the first issue also, namely, that *individuals only* are responsible for specific articles in PROGRESSIVE CALVINISM, towit, the individual whose initials or name is shown at the end. Other co-founders or members are not responsible; to require complete agreement on all subjects would be so restrictive that the welfare of the Progressive Calvinism League would be hindered. The League is open to all who accept and sign its Declarations. Beyond that there is complete freedom of opinion.

Published each month by the Progressive Calvinism League. Founders of the League: Frederick Nymeyer, John Van Mouwerik and Martin B. Nymeyer. Subscription price: $2.00 per year (for students, $1.00 per year). Address all subscriptions and communications to Progressive Calvinism League, 366 East 166th Street, South Holland, Illinois, U. S. A.

Is The Principle Underlying Socialism-Communism High and Moral and Are Only Socialist-Communist Means Immoral, Or Are Both Principle and Means Immoral?

Within the pale of Christianity Germany, aside from its extensive Catholicism, may be called Lutheran. Similarly, The Netherlands, aside from also extensive Catholicism, may be called Reformed, or Calvinist; the latter also applies to England and Scotland.

Calvinism had a revival in The Netherlands in 1834 and again in 1886. The revival in 1886 resulted in the founding of a Calvinist school, known as the Free University of Amsterdam. Among the rank and file of the Dutch Calvinists, the school is highly regarded.

This university naturally has a Department of Economic and Social Sciences. One of the professors in the Department is Dr. T. P. Vander Kooy. He has written a book, published in 1953, *Op het Grensgebied van Economie en Religie* (On the Borderland Between Economics and Religion).

Professor Vander Kooy's ideas and mine are throughout his whole book radically different. At the very end of the book Dr. Vander Kooy writes (translated):

> The writer* of a treatise on economic ethics has pointed out that the performance of labor according to ability and the enjoyment of reward according to need [the socialist-communist principle] is in accordance with the ethical demand of charity and of brotherly love. The big mistake of socialism is that it pursues a high moral principle by immoral means, yea even with spiritual coercion . . . (P. 177)

Here, Dr. Vander Kooy quotes favorably (as the context reveals) the famous socialist principle, from each according to his ability to each according to his need. He further lauds that socialist principle

* Vander Kooy here refers to a German author, W. Weddigen, who in 1951 published a book in Berlin entitled *Wirtschaftsethiek* (Economic Ethics).

as a "high moral principle." His exact words are *hoog zedelijk beginsel.*

In unqualified disagreement with Dr. Vander Kooy, we, as was made clear in the January issue of PROGRESSIVE CALVINISM, are unalterably opposed to the morality of socialism-communism, not merely because it uses coercion, violence, fraud, theft and unmitigated cruelty as a *means* to attain its ends, but because its basic *principle,* namely its principle of brotherly love (from each according to his ability to each according to his need) is vicious and immoral and unscriptural.

If the basic *principle* of socialism-communism is tolerable and even noble, as Dr. Vander Kooy indicates, and if the only moral shortcoming of socialism-communism is the *means* it employs, then all that is necessary to make socialism-communism acceptable is to induce it to discontinue certain means but to strive for the same ends, a certain so-called *social* justice according to the principle just stated — from each according to his ability to each according to his need.

The view of Dr. Vander Kooy, who is undoubtedly a leader among orthodox Calvinists in The Netherlands, shocks me. To approve the morality of the famous Marxian formula is to give up to the enemy the key fortress in the whole line. By one grand concession everything is lost.

There is a saying in Europe: "East of the Rhine there are only socialists." Amsterdam, geographically, is east of the Rhine. (We quote the saying with our tongue in our cheek, of course.)

They may not know there that by agreeing to the famous (should be infamous) socialist-communist law of love they are already ideologically in the socialist-communist camp. Dr. Vander Kooy, it should be mentioned in fairness to him, rejects socialism for technical reasons, as well as for the use of improper means, but the character of his reasoning disturbs us. To reject a great evil for lesser reasons and to accept the basic error of the evil is almost as disturbing as approval of the evil.

We have here a situation to which we called attention, in a broad way, in the January issue. We there made the point that,

with the passing of time, the adherents of certain ideas which are described by certain terms, such as the term *brotherly love,* abandon the original meaning of the idea and accept, under the same term, just the opposite idea. Figuratively speaking, everything is turned upside down. That is what has happened in this case; a professor in one of the social sciences (economics) in the believed-to-be staunchest Calvinist university in Europe accepts and praises *the* basic socialist-communist principle.

We feel constrained to challenge such error, because error it can be shown to be, as poor economics and poor ethics and poor Christianity and poor Calvinism. All, of course, unwitting and unintentional.

This explains why a major portion of this issue and several subsequent issues is devoted to an analysis of *brotherly love.* Can it properly mean today exactly the opposite of what it meant, as we understand it, in Old Testament and New Testament days? Does *brotherly love* as defined in Scripture, namely, thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself, mean "from each according to his ability to each according to his need"? Dr. Vander Kooy says the two are not incompatible and that the socialist-communist law is a high moral principle. In flat contradiction, we shall endeavor to show that it is a low, immoral principle.

F. N.

Understanding and Misunderstanding The Hebrew-Christian Law of Love

We are attending in this analysis to a very simple thing — the *correct* meaning of a term. The term is *brotherly love**. That term is used to cover an idea expressed in the famous law, thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself.

Hebrew-Christian ethics are summed up in that law. There is, we hold, no difference in the correct Hebrew and the correct Christian interpretation of the law. They are indentical.

This law on brotherly love is used, more frequently and more widely than any other rule known to us, to approve an action or

*In this article *brotherly love* and *neighborly love* are used interchangeably.

to criticize an action. This law is an almost universally accepted moral standard. By it men and the actions of men are praised or condemned.

But what *does* the law mean? Our endeavor is an attempt to show what the correct, and the only correct, definition of the law is.

It is proposed to consider four very interesting aspects of the idea of brotherly love, namely:

1. What really is the *Biblical* doctrine of brotherly love?
2. What will an analytical dissection of the concepts involved in brotherly love reveal?
3. What are the essential corrections which are needed in the interpretation of the ancient scribes who were the experts on the law, and how are those erroneous interpreations in the opposite direction from popular modern error?
4. How does a modern interpretation of the law of brotherly love result in sanctimony in profession and disaster in social affairs?

Some of the conclusions which will be derived from the following analysis are:

(1) The law on brotherly love, thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself, cannot possibly mean what many very earnest people who claim the name Christian, whether they be liberal or orthodox, think it means. What they think "loving the neighbor" means is pure fiction and hallucination.

(2) An *erroneous* idea of a moral law of brotherly love can have no validity in determining what is sound public policy, acceptable group morality and true individual morality. Neither communism, socialism, interventionism nor free enterprise can be validly judged by a *mistaken* rule.

(3) The law as frequently understood by "Christians" is not only erroneous, and a bad standard by which to judge, but an evil idea, a damnable iniquity, a sure road to ruin, and consequently it is a sure way to do eventual desperate damage to the reputation of the Christian religion. A religion which is wrong on the

relation of men to men will be estimated by most men probably to be even more wrong on the relation of men to God.

A. THE PLAIN TEACHING OF SCRIPTURE REGARDING BROTHERLY LOVE

Love—A Word With Many Meanings

There are few words which are *univocal* (yu-niv'o-cal) — that is, words which have only one meaning. Instead, nearly all important words are *equivocal* — that is, they have more than one meaning. The word *love* is not a univocal word; it is a very equivocal word.

The various meanings which the word *love* has cause confusion and mischief. It is the purpose of this analysis to see the mischief there can be in this word when it is used as a basis for morality and for determining the organization of society, that is, when it is used to describe and to designate what is thought to be the required relation of men to men, in society.

The Word, Love, in Sex Matters

The meaning of the word *love,* which is usually assumed to be the meaning intended unless the context indicates otherwise, is "sex love" and its related family love. This is not the aspect of love which will be analyzed in this little study, but it will be interesting to explore at least two meanings of the word *love* in sex matters. It will then be easier to understand that in the social science field the word *love* has equally diverse meanings.

When dealing with the opposite sex, the word *love* is hypnotic. Whisper to a girl "I *love* you" and she will always thereafter think tenderly of you unless you have a terrible case of halitosis or a monstrously crooked nose.

The word *love* in the sex sense covers two entirely different things — (1) legitimate love, and (2) illegitimate love; that is, it covers a benefit in one case and an injury in another case. There can be no doubt that the pursuit of an illicit love affair, with a prostitute or with a woman considered respectable, can be prospered by earnestly telling the woman, "I *love* you." Women (and

men) have a weakness for believing what they wish to believe. The purpose of the declaration is obvious; to say, "I *love* you," is equivalent to saying that you wish to have possession of the woman.

Such a wish to have possession of a woman may be accompanied by the intention to have no responsibility for her at all. Under the circumstances a great injury is being proposed to her under the fine-sounding term, I *love* you.

But change a few of the conditions. Assume that a young man gently and politely courts a young woman, and then respectfully sees the girl's parents and asks to have her in marriage. He will undoubtedly declare to both daughter and parents that he *loves* her. What he means is that he wishes to have possession of her. In that sense the proposition is no different whatever from the same declaration in an illicit "love" affair.

In the one case the expression, "I *love* you" pleases daughter, parents and the public. The marriage may be celebrated in a church with benefit of clergy. In the other case the expression will be couched in the same words — I love you — but daughter, parents, public and clergy (if the latter learn of it) are all highly offended.

The word *love* in sex matters, therefore, has two meanings which make the word altogether different depending on attendant circumstances. *Love* has a good meaning when it is accompanied by the intention to undertake responsibility for the support and protection of the woman; and it has an evil meaning when covering the same subject with no intention of undertaking responsibility for the woman.

In short, *love* in one instance means one thing; in another instance it means something entirely different. In the first instance it means a wonderful thing; in the second instance it means a disastrous thing. A woman who is not smart enough to understand "I love you" in one sense when it comes from an honorably intentioned man, and "I love you" in another sense when it comes from a dishonorably intentioned man will probably end up in trouble.

Similarly, a society which does not know what the sentence means — thou shalt *love* thy neighbor as thyself — will equally surely end up in dire trouble. And we have sadly noted that some

of the easiest sinners in sex matters use the word *love* most freely, and that similarly some of the easiest sinners in social matters use the word *love* equally freely.

The Two Different Meanings of Love in Social Matters

In social matters we are told we must love our neighbors as ourselves, and do unto others as we wish to be done unto. Are there (at least) two meanings to this, and if so, what are those two meanings? Yes, there are two (and more) meanings which appear to be not very dissimilar but which are as dissimilar as telling a prostitute you love her and telling the parents of a girl you wish to marry that you love her.

In the one case, thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself, means:

1. You should do as much for your neighbor as for yourself.

and in the other case, the expression means:

2. You should not harm your neighbor and should have goodwill toward him.

Lazarus, the beggar in heaven speaking in the parable to Dives in torment, declares, "There is a great gulf fixed, that they that would pass from hence to you may not be able, and that none may cross over from thence to us." The gulf between these two definitions of neighborly love, although they may look as if they differ in only a minor way, is unbridgeable.

Of these two definitions of brotherly or social love (as distinguished from sexual love) the first, that brotherly love is in essence or requires that you do as much for your neighbor as yourself and not displease him, is rejected as incorrect and evil; the second, that brotherly love simply requires that you do not harm your neighbor and that you manifest good will toward him, is accepted as correct and good. This very brief simplification of the law requiring brotherly love needs considerable explanation, which is endeavored in what follows.

To indicate the direction of this analysis we here state that the version of the law of brotherly love which requires that you do

as much for your neighbor as for yourself is a socialist and communist law; the other, which requires that you do not harm your neighbor and that you *manifest good will* toward him is in accordance with the Hebrew-Christian and the capitalist traditions. The specific socialist-communist formulation of the law of brotherly love is, from each according to his ability to each according to his need. The specific Hebrew-Christian and capitalist law of love is, thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. The former law must be interpreted as making the wish of the "neighbor" the standard; the latter law cannot *correctly* be interpreted in any other way than that the wish of a person himself is the standard, *with certain supplementary qualifications.*

Early and Late, and Repeatedly, Christians Tend to Turn to the Socialist-Communist Law of Love

The moral requirement of a law of love, that you do as much for your neighbor as for yourself, has repeatedly been considered, but erroneously, as the essential characteristic of brotherly love and as evidence of brotherly love. It is neither.

The early Christian church in Jerusalem experimented with the idea of doing as much for your neighbor as for yourself and instituted "community of goods," that is, it experimented with a *voluntary* socialism. (Orthodox socialism is not voluntary but is essentially a *coercive* system; you share with others whether you wish to do so or not, because the *group* to which you belong has decreed it — passed a law that you *must* share.) The experiment of the early Christian church in Jerusalem is described in Acts 4:34. The text reads: "For neither was there among them any that lacked: for as many as were possessors of lands and houses sold them, and brought the prices of things that were sold and laid them at the apostles' feet: and distribution was made unto each, according as any one had need." Then follows the story of Ananias and Sapphira. That their contributions were voluntary is evident from Acts 5:4; the Apostle Peter is speaking to Ananias: "While it remained, did it not remain thine own? And after it was sold was it not in thy power?"

Obviously, this was not what is meant by socialism and communism today which *are* coercive. The members of the early church

engaged in *voluntary* acts to share fully with their neighbors. In order to do that they sold their fixed assets, houses and lands, and "distributed."

The sequel tells the story. This "equalization" of wealth, this equalization of income, this egalitarian (leveling) process was eventually a dismal failure. It is not necessary to wait to know the sequel; the outcome could be positively forecast. Clearly when there is a rapid liquidation (sale) of fixed assets, it will not be long before there are no fixed assets left to liquidate (sell). What looked as if it were sensible brotherly love could by cold logic clearly be seen to be no more than a temporary living beyond their means, a spending spree, because they were "running their assets down." It was like a young man "going through his inheritance"; the rate of consumption could not be kept up indefinitely. This therefore was not unalloyed Biblical charity; there was something more added to it. Charity is not suicidal; egalitarianism always is. The penalties of egalitarianism in the end, in a staggering manner, outweigh the benefits in the beginning.

The sequel is clearly indicated in the Apostle Paul's letter to the Galatians, chapter two, verse 10. Paul had gone to Jerusalem to see Peter and James and settle certain matters. Then Paul was to go his way again, but Peter and James, elders in the mother church, probably once rich but now evidently poor, obtained from Paul the promise that he would hold in his distant and new and struggling churches, collections for the *poor in Jerusalem.* Clearly the emotional spree of too much brotherly love (not really *sound* brotherly love) had left the original church exhausted and mendicant (begging).

The lesson is plain for all to read and learn.

We are not saying that the dissipation of the property of the members of the first church in Jerusalem was a sin. It was not sin, because it was a *voluntary* dissipation. If it had been a *coercive* distribution it would undoubtedly have been a gross sin. The members, as Peter said, could do what they pleased. They were in a frame of mind to have a financial honeymoon; as Solomon sardonically says, there is a time for everything — including spending. And it *can* be argued that it is really a good thing to live lavishly today even though you will not have enough to eat tomorrow.

There is nothing in Scripture which says that you cannot decide to make life exciting by doing things in extremes. We, therefore, make no criticism of the acts of the first church in Jerusalem, but we do call attention to the facts, namely:

1. They were on a spending spree.
2. It could not last long.
3. It did not last long.
4. The pay-off consisted in their being so poor that they had to ask struggling foreign churches to send them "poor collections." In short, they followed a short-lived, and a short-sighted, and a not-wise policy. That was their business. But nobody is under any obligation to imitate them. And everybody is entitled to his opinion of what he thinks of their wisdom or foolishness.

It is equally instructive to take a more modern example, the Puritans in New England. These people were Calvinists, austere, hard-working; a generation of them, in England, had bounced England into the front ranks of prosperity. Henry Hazlitt, quoting Betty Knowles Hunt, has described the situation well (by quoting largely from Governor Bradford's record). (We retain the original spelling in the quotation.)

> Most of us have forgotten that when the Pilgrim Fathers landed on the shores of Massachusetts they established a Communist system. Out of their common product and storehouse they set up a system of rationing, though it came to "but a quarter of a pound of bread a day to each person." Even when harvest came, "it arose to but a little." A vicious circle seemed to set in. The people complained that they were too weak from want of food to tend the crops as they should. Deeply religious though they were, they took to stealing from each other. "So as it well appeared," writes Governor Bradford, "that famine must still insue the next year allso, if not some way prevented."
>
> So the colonists, he continues, "began to thinke how they might raise as much corne as they could, and obtaine a beter crope than they had done, that they might not still thus languish in miserie. At length [in 1623] after

much debate of things, the Gov. (with the advise of the cheefest amongest them) gave way that they should set corne every man for his owne perticuler, and in that regard trust to them selves . . . And so assigned to every family a parcell of land . . .

"This had very good success; for it made all hands very industrious, so as much more corne was planted then other waise would have bene by any means the Gov. or any other could use, and saved him a great deall of trouble, and gave farr better contente.

"The women now wente willingly into the feild, and tooke their litle-ons with them to set corne, which before would aledg weakness, and inabilitie; whom to have compelled would have bene thought great tiranie and oppression.

"The experience that was had in this commone course and condition, tried sundrie years, and that amongst godly and sober men, may well evince the vanitie of that conceite of Platos and other ancients, applauded by some of later times; — that the taking away of propertie, and bringing in communitie into a comone wealth, would make them happy and florishing; as if they were wiser than God. For this comunite (so farr as it was) was found to breed much confusion and discontent, and retard much imployment that would have been to their benefite and comforte.

"For the yong-men that were most able and fitte for labour and service did repine that they should spend their time and streingth to worke for other mens wives and children, with out any recompense. The strong, or man of parts, had no more in devission of victails and cloaths, than he that was weake and not able to doe a quarter the other could; this was thought injuestice . . .

"And for men's wives to be commanded to doe servise for other men, as dressing their meate, washing their cloaths, etc., they deemd it a kind of slaverie, neither could many husbands well brook it . . .

> "By this time harvest was come, and instead of famine, now God gave them plentie, and the face of things was changed, to the rejoysing of the harts of many, for which they blessed God. And the effect of their particuler [private] planting was well seene, for all had, one way and other, pretty well to bring the year aboute, and some of the abler sorte and more industrious had to spare, and sell to others, so as any generall wante or famine hath not been amongest them since to this day."

Hazlitt adds one paragraph in comment on the foregoing. It is: "The moral is too obvious to need elaboration."

To believe that *brotherly love* requires that you do as much for your neighbor as for yourself by equal sharing or by not hurting his feelings (however that might be accomplished) is a hallucination. Scripture does not teach it; nor does experience.

We turn to what Scripture *does* teach about brotherly love, namely, that it requires not injuring your neighbor and good will — and no more. It will be profitable to analyze this scriptural idea in considerable detail.

The Old Testament On the Law of Love

The great emphasis on the affirmative statement of the Second Table of the Law in the form, thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself, is in the New Testament, the second of the Two Books which are the basis of the Christian religion. Christ is popularly considered to be the formulator of the condensed commandment to love the neighbor as thyself. But there is considerable reason to believe that there was nothing unusual or especially advanced in His formulation of the Law. Probably the statement had already for a considerable time had that formulation, and Christ was merely expressing a fairly common sentiment.

The evidence on that is really interesting. In Luke 10:25-28 the following is written:

> And behold, a certain lawyer stood up and made trial of him, saying, Teacher, what shall I do to inherit eternal

> life? An he [Christ] said unto him [the lawyer], What is written in the law? how readest thou? And he [the lawyer] answering said, Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy strength, and with all thy mind; and thy neighbor as thyself. And he [Christ] said unto him, Thou hast answered right; this do, and thou shalt live.

The lawyer, as well as Christ, and as was probably true of most of the hearers, was thoroughly familiar with the idea that the Second Table of the Law could be very briefly summarized by saying: love thy neighbor as thyself.

It is not surprising that there had come to be a general acceptance of the idea, thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. If any natural as well as supernatural origin is to be sought in Christ's brilliant understanding of the Law, then the attention is immediately directed to the Old Testament as a probably direct or indirect source for Christ's statement. In fact, a careful review of the ideas Christ propounded will reveal that all His ideas were rooted in and that His thinking was saturated with ideas from the Old Testament.

The exact statement, thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself, appears in the Old Testament, 1400 years before Christ, in Leviticus 19:18b, as a *positive* statement to summarize the *negative* commandments in the preceding verses, 11-18a.

> Ye shall not steal; neither shall ye deal falsely, nor lie one to another. And ye shall not swear by my name falsely, and profane the name of thy God: I am Jehovah. Thou shalt not oppress thy neighbor, nor rob him: the wages of a hired servant shall not abide with thee all night until the morning. Thou shalt not curse the deaf, nor put a stumblingblock before the blind; but thou shalt fear thy God: I am Jehovah. Ye shall do no unrighteousness in judgment: thou shalt not respect the person of the poor, nor honor the person of the mighty; but in righteousness shalt thou judge thy neighbor. Thou shalt not go up and down as a talebearer among thy people: neither shalt thou stand against the blood of thy neighbor: I am Jehovah. Thou shalt not hate thy brother in thy heart: thou shalt

surely rebuke thy neighbor, and not bear sin because of him. Thou shalt not take vengeance, nor bear any grudge against the children of thy people; but thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself: I am Jehovah.

The parallelism in the Old and the New Testaments is perfect — both state the negative commandments and both state the positive commandment. They are perfectly agreed.

The Identity of the Positive Law and the Last Five Commandments

Scripture declares that the Ten Commandments were written by God himself. They must, therefore, by devout Christians be considered perfect and complete. The last five of the Ten Commandments are negative — thou shalt not kill, commit adultery, steal, lie, nor covet. Anyone disparaging the negative form of these five commandments, and declaring they should have been positive or affirmative is too bold in his criticism. The negative form of the Second Table of the Law is not, it is believed by us, anything to be criticized, but rather something to be pleased about and to be lauded.

It is striking that in all the New Testament references to the requirement of loving the neighbor there is the unvarying and identical explanation of that Law by saying it means: thou shalt not kill, commit adultery, steal, lie nor covet. The law, thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself, as so prominently promulgated by Christ in the New Testament, *is never* explained except by prohibition of killing (violence), adultery, theft, lying and coveting, and, it may be confidently added, *cannot* be explained except by such specific prohibitions. Because of the importance of the point we shall quote the relevant scriptural passages (in addition to Luke 10:28 already quoted):

Matthew 22:34-40. But the Pharisees, when they heard that he had put the Sadducees to silence, gathered themselves together. And one of them, a lawyer asked him a question, trying him: Teacher, which is the great commandment in the law? And he said unto him, Thou shalt

love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind. This is the great and first commandment. And a second like *unto it* is this, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. On these two commandments the whole law hangeth, and the prophets.

Mark 12:28-34. And one of the scribes came, and heard them questioning together, and knowing that he had answered them well, asked him, What commandment is the first of all? Jesus answered, The first is, Hear, O Israel; The Lord our God, the Lord is one; and thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind, and with all thy strength. The second is this, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. There is none other commandment greater than these. And the scribe said unto him, Of a truth, Teacher, thou hast well said that he is one; and there is none other but he: and to love him with all the heart, and with all the understanding, and with all the strength, and to love his neighbor as himself, is much more than all whole burnt-offerings and sacrifices. And when Jesus saw that he answered discreetly, he said unto him, Thou art not far from the kingdom of God. And no man after that durst ask him any question.

Romans 13:8-10. Owe no man anything, save to love one another: for he that loveth his neighbor hath fulfilled the law. For this, Thou shalt not commit adultery, Thou shalt not kill, Thou shalt not steal, Thou shalt not covet, and if there be any other commandment, it is summed up in this word, namely, thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. Love worketh no ill to his neighbor: love therefore is the fulfillment of the law.

II John 1:6. And this is love, that we should walk after His commandments.

The Original Law of Love Between Mankind

There is a great deal to be added to the foregoing before there is a full understanding of what is meant by, thou shalt love

thy neighbor as thyself, but certain simple, positive statements can already be made with complete confidence and with complete accuracy; they are:

(1) The teachings of the Old Testament and the New Testament on, thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself, are *identical.* There is not a scintilla of difference.

(2) *Basically* the law, thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself means nothing more than that you should not harm your neighbor. As Paul said: "Love worketh no ill to his neighbor," and because he equates that with "love," therefore working no ill to his neighbor is "the fulfillment of the law." John, the apostle of love, says the identical thing. "And this is love, that we should walk after His commandments" (obviously referring to the Second Table of the Law). (This statement will appear controversial to some. We call attention to our use of the word *basically.* Remove that word, and then our statement will not stand. Clearly, we admit something of less importance must be added, for special reasons. But what is added is not the *essence* of the law of brotherly love. The *essence* of the law is *not-to-harm-the-neighbor.* It is not possible, here, to develop the supplementary features of the law of brotherly love. We are now stating only the *basic* law, as written by the finger of God, and given to Moses. All errors in regard to the law of brotherly love stem from a subtle denial of the correctness of what God gave Moses.)

(3) The Second Table of the Law (to honor father and mother, not kill, not commit adultery, not steal, not lie, not covet) — not to harm one another — was all there was to the Commandments *before* the Fall of Adam and Eve in paradise, they were the *whole* law on the relation of men to men. Nothing needed to be added. Because of the design of the world by predestination (almost certainly supralapsarian) and because of the entrance of sin, something more must be added to the foregoing explanation, but we shall show eventually that what must be added because of the predestination of sin would not, if sin had been excluded, have been a part of the basic commandments.

(4) To those who would lament that this robs the Second Table of the Law of "love" — nice, sentimental, gushy affection and self-sacrificing services as were perpetrated by the early church members in Jerusalem and the devout Puritans in New England —we shall develop an answer in what follows to the effect that such love is neither wise, nor workable.

The reader who has been thinking more sentimentally about "love" than the foregoing analysis suggests, and who has already grasped the arms of his chair and is lifting himself up in wrath (not in "love"!) will probably pull the chair up with him when he reads that we quietly add that there is a famous expression in economics and business which covers exactly the same idea. It is *laissez-faire. Laissez-faire,* when it is correctly understood, has in business exactly the same meaning as is given in the foregoing to the plain and obvious and consistent teachings of Scripture. The term means: let business alone; permit it to be free; do not interfere. That formulation of *laissez-faire* ASSUMES the laws (of God) are being followed, and that beyond that business should be *free. Laissez-faire* is in the field of business an identical concept to the Second Table of the Law — freedom *except you may not, as Paul wrote, "work ill to your neighbor."*

We now come to what must be added to the original law of love *because of sin,* and what in a parallel manner must be added to *laisse-faire* because of sin. This eventually leads us to the famous Sermon on the Mount, summarized in Matthew, chapters five to seven, in the New Testament, and also in corresponding passages in Mark and Luke. Before doing so it will be well to analyze what may be concluded and what may not be concluded from what has already been reviewed.

B. ANALYTICAL DISSECTION OF SCRIPTURAL LAW OF BROTHERLY LOVE

(*To be continued in the next issue of* Progressive Calvinism.)

Reprint of an Editorial from the CALVIN COLLEGE CHIMES about the First Issue of PROGRESSIVE CALVINISM

The *Calvin College Chimes,* founded in 1906, is published weekly by the students of Calvin College under the authority of the Student Council. The subscription rate is $2.00. The Editor-in-chief is Ronald Jager.

A one-column editorial signed "R. J." appears on page 2 of the February 11, 1954 issue. (We believe the date should be February 11, 1955; at any rate the folio number is XLIX, number 16.) This editorial we are reproducing in full exactly as it appeared.

As the next to the last paragraph reveals, the *Calvin College Chimes'* editorial writer estimates that it [*Chimes*] "is also, perhaps, the only institution that will expend any energy combatting the nebulous fogs of PROGRESSIVE CALVINISM." From this then we may expect further evaluation of PROGRESSIVE CALVINISM from the *Chimes.* We welcome that. And then, if we accept the editorial writer's estimate about the attitude of other publications toward PROGRESSIVE CALVINISM then we must expect that no other publication will take note of us. We shall regret that.

The reason why we welcome criticism is because we subscribe to what John Stuart Mill wrote in his famous essay *On Liberty,* namely:

> . . . All silencing of discussion is an assumption of infallibility.
>
> * * *
>
> . . . There is the greatest difference between presuming an opinion to be true, because, with every opportunity for contesting it, it has not been refuted, and

assuming its truth for the purpose of not permitting its refutation. Complete liberty of contradicting and disproving our opinion, is the very condition which justifies us in assuming its truth for purposes of action; and on no other terms can a being with human faculties have any rational assurance of being right.

* * *

. . . In the case of any person whose judgment is really deserving of confidence, how has it become so? Because he has kept his mind open to criticism of his opinions and conduct. Because it has been his practice to listen to all that could be said against him; to profit by as much of it as was just, and expound to himself, and upon occasion to others, the fallacy of what was fallacious. Because he has felt, that the only way in which a human being can make some approach to knowing the whole of a subject, is by hearing what can be said about it by persons of every variety of opinion, and studying all modes in which it can be looked at by every character of mind. No wise man ever acquired his wisdom in any mode but this; nor is it in the nature of human intellect to become wise in any other manner. The steady habit of correcting and completing his own opinion by collating it with those of others, so far from causing doubt and hesitation in carrying it into practice, is the only stable foundation for a just reliance on it: for, being cognizant of all that can, at least obviously, be said against him, and having taken up his position against all gainsayers — knowing that he has sought for objections and difficulties, instead of avoiding them, and has shut out no light which can be thrown upon the subject from any quarter — he has a right to think his judgment better than that of any person, or any multitude, who have not gone through a similar process.

* * *

> . . . However unwillingly a person who has a strong opinion may admit the possibility that his opinion may be false, he ought to be moved by the consideration that however true it may be, if it is not fully, frequently and fearlessly discussed, it will be held as a dead dogma, not a living truth.

In agreement with Mill, we admit that we are not entitled to hold an opinion with conviction unless we are prepared to have it attacked.

We shall be particularly interested in what the editorial folk of the *Chimes* write, because it will be possible to make one of two inferences: (1) that the editorial staff has some "solitary thinkers," or (2) that the editorial staff reflects the ideas and the character of the faculty of Calvin College. The latter of the two possibilities makes what appears in the *Chimes* highly significant. In the case of young people, except the very highly talented and really intellectually independent, the great probability is that they are reflecting the ideas and principles of their teachers. We do not know whether the writer of this editorial in the *Chimes* is a solitary thinker or a reflector of ideas in the Calvin College faculty.

The enthusiasm of students for the faculty of their school is often humorously referred to by telling the story of the survey made among students in various schools about their estimate regarding who were the three greatest philosophers of all time. The survey, so goes the story, showed a remarkably definite pattern; the three greatest philosophers of all time were: Plato, Kant, and the head of the philosophy department of that particular college.

What follows is the *Calvin College Chimes'* editorial about the first issue of PROGRESSIVE CALVINISM.

(A Reprint from *Calvin College Chimes*)

"PROGRESSIVE CALVINISM"

This past Monday's mail forced upon the attention of almost every Calvin student the activities of a newly organized group of social reformers which has called itself the Progressive Calvinism League.

Now there are some people to whom one speaks with difficulty; there are others to whom one speaks in vain. Consequently this editorial is not directed at Calvinism's latest League. The League itself will be interesting, and either funny or pathetic to some; it will be ignored by many and taken seriously by a few. It is primarily to these last two groups that this is written; others may read it for the satisfaction of finding in print what they already know.

The first publication of the League — "a pioneer in social thought and research" — was last Monday's twenty-four page pseudo-intellectual Dagwood sandwich: a layer of Plato, a layer of cliches about morality and Scripture, some apple sauce about missions, a layer of Whitehead, more platitudes . . . This social-political-economic-literary epoch-maker was, I gather from page fifteen, produced by special arrangement with the tenth Muse who communicates only to the select and has made the P.C.L. privy to the truth. Either that or we have here the workings of an anthology mentality, random reading on an assortment of unrelated topics, and an infinite capacity for fallacious reasoning. At any rate, having announced themselves as authorities and judges in Israel, the founders of the P.C.L. like the Samarian lepers are now disclosing their revelations. Concretely, this means that these self styled reformers are about to call the Calvinistic world to order and reprove it for its misdirected values.

There is a naivete about all this that almost inspires pity for its perversion of religious sincerity. "Scripture and science together can help us," say the founders; "We are enthusiasts about both." But being enthusiasts about both means by definition and by practice that they are scholars about neither. This is unfortunate since these brethren obviously consider themselves to be religious and social critics of a rather significant variety. Christian charity compells some sympathy for such immaturity of purpose and such misunderstanding of Calvinism.

For they do indeed misunderstand Calvinism. Behind the heaped-up cliches and intellectual capsules there are operating

some notions about religion and society whose absurdity is their own best refutation:

. . . Scripture, we are informed, is concerned not about ends or purposes, but about means. This, I admit, is really pioneering. (Of course, Arius and Arminius were also pioneers of an analogous stripe, but I seem to recall they had SOME basis for their views.)

. . . Plato, nasty pagan that he was, had a "double standard of morality." So Plato is expelled and all of Greek culture with him. ("Love of culture" stems from an inferioity complex anyway.)

. . . Prosperity and material benefit, it is asserted, follow the Christian religion as his shadow follows a man. "Why become a Christian if it does not pay to do so?" But some Christians are in distress and poverty, we are told, and the reason is (1) because of an enemy, or (2) because of combinations of circumstances." If superficially has ever exposed itself in more crass form than this brilliant bit of ankle-deep analysis it was not done in the name of intelligence.

All this and much more lip-wisdom is pasted together by a preoccupation with an apologia for wealth and an aversion to social planning, the latter so undocumented that it does not deserve the respectibility of being called reactionary. The whole is then capped with an "address to talented students" which is calculated to rescue those "brilliant and ambitious persons" whose writings in "Calvin College Chimes and other student publications" indicate an "arid and steril intellectual climate." So far CHIMES is the only contemporary institution weighed and wanting. It is also, perhaps, the only institution that will expend any energy combatting the nebulous fogs of Progressive Calvinism: for the P.C.L. is not more than a drop of an idea diffused into a hazy mist, and others will realize, perhaps better than we, that you cannot dispell fog with hand grenades.

So what about it all? For one thing CHIMES does not oppose a re-examination of Calvinism and a re-application of its principles to an ever changing society; we favor few things more. But Progressive Calvinism (an ill-chosen and meaningless name that never does get around to defining itself), judging by its first publication, has offered no credentials for such an undertaking. Nevertheless, the League seems to have no want of religious enthusiasm, it has ample audacity and no little presumption, it has a most ambitious program and is assumed to be well financed; it lacks only discerning thought, an understanding of Calvinism, and a real message for the Christian Reformed citizens of Hadleyburg. —R. J.

(End of Reprint from *Calvin College Chimes*)

Membership and Subscription Terms

Membership in the League

Membership in the League depends on signature to the Declarations. Annual membership fee is $2.00 ($1.00 for students). Membership fee also covers a one-year subscription to PROGRESSIVE CALVINISM. The right is retained by the officers of the League not to accept an application.

Subscription Only

You may wish to subscribe to PROGRESSIVE CALVINISM without becoming a member in the League, which is possible; we shall be happy to have you as a subscriber only. Annual subscription is $2.00 ($1.00 for students).

(Use the enclosed return envelope for your convenience in signing the Declarations and/or subscribing to PROGRESSIVE CALVINISM.)

PROGRESSIVE CALVINISM LEAGUE
366 East 166th Street
South Holland, Illinois, U.S.A.

BULK RATE
U. S. Postage
PAID
SOUTH HOLLAND,
Permit No. 1

POSTMASTER:
If change of address on file, notify us on Form 3547 (for which postage is guaranteed).
If not deliverable, check reason in spaces below. Return postage guaranteed.
☐ Returned at sender's request
☐ No such Post Office in state named
☐ Moved—left no address
☐ Refused
☐ Unclaimed or unknown